

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 56 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 30 have been amended.

Claims 1 – 31 and 38 – 56 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haartsen in view of Hadwiger et al. Claims 32-37 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haartsen in view of Hadwiger et al., and further in view of Singh. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In rejecting claims 1,26,38,42,49 and 53, the Examiner asserts that Haartsen discloses, “wherein accesses by the one or more other bus masters to the bus are restricted in response to a signal indicative of a change in a mode of operation of the RF circuit” at Col. 2, lines 9-18. Applicant respectfully disagrees. This section of Haartsen does not disclose or suggest “wherein accesses by the one or more other bus masters to the bus are restricted in response to a signal indicative of a change in a mode of operation of the RF circuit” as recited in claim 1. Instead, this section of Haartsen teaches that an interrupt routine is entered in response to the interrupt signal.

In addition, the Examiner acknowledges that Haartsen does not disclose “one or more other bus masters coupled to the bus; and configured to arbitrate between request to access the bus by the first bus master and the one or more other bus masters; wherein the bus arbiter is further configured to implement a less favorable arbitration policy for the one or more other bus masters in response to a signal indicating a change to an active mode of operation of the RF circuit.” The examiner asserts that, however, “it would have been obvious...to modify the processor of Haartsen with the multiple processor core of Hadwiger to provide a cost effective solution for mobile phones that require multiple processors.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion, and submits that there is absolutely no suggestion in either of the references to combine their teachings in a manner that would render the claims obvious.

Applicant notes that Hadwiger discloses an architecture supported by a bus arbitration method including hierarchical application of an interrupt-based method, an assigned slot rotation method and a round-robin method (see Abstract). Hadwiger does not disclose or suggest “a bus

arbiter configured to arbitrate between requests to access the bus by the first bus master and the one or more other bus masters; **wherein accesses by the one or more other bus masters to the bus are restricted in response to a signal indicative of a change in a mode of operation of the RF circuit**” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, even if, arguendo, the teachings of Haartsen and Hardwiger were combined as suggested by the Examiner, such a hypothetical combination would still not anticipate the combination as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Applicant further respectfully disagrees with many of the Examiner’s characterizations of the cited references in regard to the dependent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-18 patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the above reasons.

In addition, Claims 19, 24, and 30 recite features similar to those of claim 1, and are accordingly also believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the above reasons, along with their respective dependent claims.

Applicant further respectfully submits that neither Haartsen nor Hadwiger discloses or suggests “**wherein accesses by the one or more other bus masters to the bus are restricted in response to a signal asserted a predetermined amount of time prior to a shutdown mode of operation of the digital processing circuit**” as variously recited in claims 36 and 46.

Likewise, neither Haartsen nor Hadwiger discloses or suggests “**wherein the bus arbiter is further configured to implement a less favorable arbitration policy for the one or more other bus masters in response to a signal indicating a change to an active mode of operation of the RF circuit**” as recited in claim 39.

Finally, neither Haartsen nor Hadwiger discloses or suggests “**wherein accesses by the one or more other bus masters to the bus are restricted during a second period of operation**

beginning a predetermined amount of time prior to an active mode of the RF circuit" as recited in claim 49.

Accordingly, claims 36, 39, 46 and 49, along with their respective dependent claims, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the above reasons.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any required fees are missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5797-00500/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noel Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN,
KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8800
Date: 6.27.06